

AVT  
Internet-Draft  
Expires: May 1, 2004

T. Turletti  
MIT  
C. Huitema  
Microsoft  
R. Even  
Polycom  
November 2003

**RTP Payload Format for H.261 Video Streams**  
**draft-ietf-avt-rfc2032-bis-00.txt**

Status of this Memo

This document is an Internet-Draft and is in full conformance with all provisions of [Section 10 of RFC2026](#).

Internet-Drafts are working documents of the Internet Engineering Task Force (IETF), its areas, and its working groups. Note that other groups may also distribute working documents as Internet-Drafts.

Internet-Drafts are draft documents valid for a maximum of six months and may be updated, replaced, or obsoleted by other documents at any time. It is inappropriate to use Internet-Drafts as reference material or to cite them other than as "work in progress."

The list of current Internet-Drafts can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/ietf/1id-abstracts.txt>.

The list of Internet-Draft Shadow Directories can be accessed at <http://www.ietf.org/shadow.html>.

This Internet-Draft will expire on May 1, 2004.

Copyright Notice

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2003). All Rights Reserved.

Abstract

This memo describes a scheme to packetize an H.261 video stream for transport using the Real-time Transport Protocol, RTP, with any of the underlying protocols that carry RTP.

This specification is a product of the Audio/Video Transport working group within the Internet Engineering Task Force. Comments are solicited and should be addressed to the working group's mailing list and/or the authors.



## Table of Contents

<a href="#">1.</a>	Introduction . . . . .	<a href="#">3</a>
<a href="#">2.</a>	Structure of the packet stream . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">2.1</a>	Overview of the ITU-T recommendation H.261 . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">2.2</a>	Considerations for packetization . . . . .	<a href="#">4</a>
<a href="#">3.</a>	Specification of the packetization scheme . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">3.1</a>	Usage of RTP . . . . .	<a href="#">6</a>
<a href="#">3.2</a>	Recommendations for operation with hardware codecs . . . . .	<a href="#">8</a>
<a href="#">4.</a>	Packet loss issues . . . . .	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">4.1</a>	Use of optional H.261-specific control packets . . . . .	<a href="#">10</a>
<a href="#">4.2</a>	H.261 control packets definition . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">4.2.1</a>	Full INTRA-frame Request (FIR) packet . . . . .	<a href="#">11</a>
<a href="#">4.2.2</a>	Negative Acknowledgements (NACK) packet . . . . .	<a href="#">12</a>
<a href="#">5.</a>	Payload Format Parameters . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">5.1</a>	IANA Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">5.1.1</a>	Registration of MIME media type video/H261 . . . . .	<a href="#">13</a>
<a href="#">5.2</a>	SDP Parameters . . . . .	<a href="#">14</a>
<a href="#">6.</a>	Security Considerations . . . . .	<a href="#">15</a>
<a href="#">7.</a>	Acknowledgements . . . . .	<a href="#">16</a>
<a href="#">8.</a>	Requirements notation . . . . .	<a href="#">17</a>
<a href="#">9.</a>	changes from <a href="#">RFC 2032</a> > . . . . .	<a href="#">18</a>
	Normative References . . . . .	<a href="#">19</a>
	Informative References . . . . .	<a href="#">20</a>
	Authors' Addresses . . . . .	<a href="#">20</a>
	Intellectual Property and Copyright Statements . . . . .	<a href="#">22</a>



## **1. Introduction**

The ITU-T recommendation H.261[H261] specifies the encoding used by ITU-T compliant video-conference codecs. Although these encoding were originally specified for fixed data rate ISDN circuits, experiments [[INRIA](#)], [[MICE](#)] have shown that they can also be used over packet-switched networks such as the Internet.

The purpose of this memo is to specify the RTP payload format for encapsulating H.261 video streams in RTP[RFC3550].

## **2. Structure of the packet stream**

### **2.1 Overview of the ITU-T recommendation H.261**

The H.261 coding is organized as a hierarchy of groupings. The video stream is composed of a sequence of images, or frames, which are themselves organized as a set of Groups of Blocks (GOB). Note that H.261 "pictures" are referred as "frames" in this document. Each GOB holds a set of 3 lines of 11 macro blocks (MB). Each MB carries information on a group of 16x16 pixels: luminance information is specified for 4 blocks of 8x8 pixels, while chrominance information is given by two "red" and "blue" color difference components at a resolution of only 8x8 pixels. These components and the codes representing their sampled values are as defined in the ITU-R Recommendation 601 [[BT601](#)].

This grouping is used to specify information at each level of the hierarchy:

- At the frame level, one specifies information such as the delay from the previous frame, the image format, and various indicators.
- At the GOB level, one specifies the GOB number and the default quantifier that will be used for the MBs.
- At the MB level, one specifies which blocks are present and which did not change, and optionally a quantifier and motion vectors.

Blocks which have changed are encoded by computing the discrete cosine transform (DCT) of their coefficients, which are then quantized and Huffman encoded (Variable Length Codes).

The H.261 Huffman encoding includes a special "GOB start" pattern, composed of 15 zeroes followed by a single 1, that cannot be imitated by any other code words. This pattern is included at the beginning of each GOB header (and also at the beginning of each frame header) to mark the separation between two GOBs, and is in fact used as an indicator that the current GOB is terminated. The encoding also includes a stuffing pattern, composed of seven zeroes followed by four ones; that stuffing pattern can only be entered between the encoding of MBs, or just before the GOB separator.

### **2.2 Considerations for packetization**

H.261 codecs designed for operation over ISDN circuits produce a bit stream composed of several levels of encoding specified by H.261 and companion recommendations. The bits resulting from the Huffman encoding are arranged in 512-bit frames, containing 2 bits of



synchronization, 492 bits of data and 18 bits of error correcting code. The 512-bit frames are then interlaced with an audio stream and transmitted over px64 kbps circuits according to specification H.221 [[H221](#)].

When transmitting over the Internet, we will directly consider the output of the Huffman encoding. All the bits produced by the Huffman encoding stage will be included in the packet. We will not carry the 512-bit frames, as protection against bit errors can be obtained by other means. Similarly, we will not attempt to multiplex audio and video signals in the same packets, as UDP and RTP provide a much more efficient way to achieve multiplexing.

Directly transmitting the result of the Huffman encoding over an unreliable stream of UDP datagrams would, however, have poor error resistance characteristics. The result of the hierarchical structure of H.261 bit stream is that one needs to receive the information present in the frame header to decode the GOBs, as well as the information present in the GOB header to decode the MBs. Without precautions, this would mean that one has to receive all the packets that carry an image in order to properly decode its components.

If each image could be carried in a single packet, this requirement would not create a problem. However, a video image or even one GOB by itself can sometimes be too large to fit in a single packet. Therefore, the MB is taken as the unit of fragmentation. Packets must start and end on a MB boundary, i.e. a MB cannot be split across multiple packets. Multiple MBs may be carried in a single packet when they will fit within the maximal packet size allowed. This practice is recommended to reduce the packet send rate and packet overhead.

To allow each packet to be processed independently for efficient resynchronization in the presence of packet losses, some state information from the frame header and GOB header is carried with each packet to allow the MBs in that packet to be decoded. This state information includes the GOB number in effect at the start of the packet, the macroblock address predictor (i.e. the last MBA encoded in the previous packet), the quantizer value in effect prior to the start of this packet (GQUANT, MQANT or zero in case of a beginning of GOB) and the reference motion vector data (MVD) for computing the true MVDs contained within this packet. The bit stream cannot be fragmented between a GOB header and MB 1 of that GOB.

Moreover, since the compressed MB may not fill an integer number of octets, the data header contains two three-bit integers, SBIT and EBIT, to indicate the number of unused bits in the first and last octets of the H.261 data, respectively.









+--+

The H.261 header is defined as following:

										0										1										2										3									
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9										
+--+																																																	
SBIT			EBIT			I V			GOBN				MBAP					QUANT					HMVD					VMVD																					
+--+																																																	

The fields in the H.261 header have the following meanings:

Start bit position (SBIT): 3 bits

Number of most significant bits that should be ignored in the first data octet.

End bit position (EBIT): 3 bits

Number of least significant bits that should be ignored in the last data octet.

INTRA-frame encoded data (I): 1 bit

Set to 1 if this stream contains only INTRA-frame coded blocks. Set to 0 if this stream may or may not contain INTRA-frame coded blocks. The sense of this bit may not change during the course of the RTP session.

Motion Vector flag (V): 1 bit

Set to 0 if motion vectors are not used in this stream. Set to 1 if motion vectors may or may not be used in this stream. The sense of this bit may not change during the course of the session.

GOB number (GOBN): 4 bits

Encodes the GOB number in effect at the start of the packet. Set to 0 if the packet begins with a GOB header.

Macroblock address predictor (MBAP): 5 bits

Encodes the macroblock address predictor (i.e. the last MBA encoded in the previous packet). This predictor ranges from 0-32 (to predict the valid MBAs 1-33), but because the bit stream cannot be fragmented between a GOB header and MB 1, the predictor at the start of the packet can never be 0. Therefore, the range is 1-32, which is biased



by -1 to fit in 5 bits. For example, if MBAP is 0, the value of the MBA predictor is 1. Set to 0 if the packet begins with a GOB header.

Quantizer (QUANT): 5 bits

Quantizer value (MQANT or GQUANT) in effect prior to the start of this packet. Set to 0 if the packet begins with a GOB header.

Horizontal motion vector data (HMVD): 5 bits

Reference horizontal motion vector data (MVD). Set to 0 if V flag is 0 or if the packet begins with a GOB header, or when the MTYPE of the last MB encoded in the previous packet was not MC. HMVD is encoded as a 2's complement number, and '10000' corresponding to the value -16 is forbidden (motion vector fields range from +/-15).

Vertical motion vector data (VMVD): 5 bits

Reference vertical motion vector data (MVD). Set to 0 if V flag is 0 or if the packet begins with a GOB header, or when the MTYPE of the last MB encoded in the previous packet was not MC. VMVD is encoded as a 2's complement number, and '10000' corresponding to the value -16 is forbidden (motion vector fields range from +/-15).

Note that the I and V flags are hint flags, i.e. they can be inferred from the bit stream. They are included to allow decoders to make optimizations that would not be possible if these hints were not provided before bit stream was decoded. Therefore, these bits cannot change for the duration of the stream. A conformant implementation can always set V=1 and I=0.

### **3.2 Recommendations for operation with hardware codecs**

Packetizers for hardware codecs can trivially figure out GOB boundaries using the GOB-start pattern included in the H.261 data. (Note that software encoders already know the boundaries.) The cheapest packetization implementation is to packetize at the GOB level all the GOBs that fit in a packet. But when a GOB is too large, the packetizer has to parse it to do MB fragmentation. (Note that only the Huffman encoding must be parsed and that it is not necessary to fully decompress the stream, so this requires relatively little processing; example implementations can be found in some public H.261 codecs such as IVS [[IVS](#)] and VIC [[VIC](#)].) It is recommended that MB level fragmentation be used when feasible in order to obtain more efficient packetization. Using this fragmentation scheme reduces the output packet rate and therefore reduces the overhead.



At the receiver, the data stream can be depacketized and directed to a hardware codec's input. If the hardware decoder operates at a fixed bit rate, synchronization may be maintained by inserting the stuffing pattern between MBs (i.e., between packets) when the packet arrival rate is slower than the bit rate.



#### **4. Packet loss issues**

On the Internet, most packet losses are due to network congestion rather than transmission errors. Using UDP, no mechanism is available at the sender to know if a packet has been successfully received. It is up to the application, i.e. coder and decoder, to handle the packet loss. Each RTP packet includes a sequence number field which can be used to detect packet loss.

H.261 uses the temporal redundancy of video to perform compression. This differential coding (or INTER-frame coding) is sensitive to packet loss. After a packet loss, parts of the image may remain corrupt until all corresponding MBs have been encoded in INTRA-frame mode (i.e. encoded independently of past frames). There are several ways to mitigate packet loss:

(1) One way is to use only INTRA-frame encoding and MB level conditional replenishment. That is, only MBs that change (beyond some threshold) are transmitted.

(2) Another way is to adjust the INTRA-frame encoding refreshment rate according to the packet loss observed by the receivers. The H.261 recommendation specifies that a MB is INTRA-frame encoded at least every 132 times it is transmitted. However, the INTRA-frame refreshment rate can be raised in order to speed the recovery when the measured loss rate is significant.

(3) The fastest way to repair a corrupted image is to request an INTRA-frame coded image refreshment after a packet loss is detected. One means to accomplish this is for the decoder to send to the coder a list of packets lost. The coder can decide to encode every MB of every GOB of the following video frame in INTRA-frame mode (i.e. Full INTRA-frame encoded), or if the coder can deduce from the packet sequence numbers which MBs were affected by the loss, it can save bandwidth by sending only those MBs in INTRA-frame mode. This mode is particularly efficient in point-to-point connection or when the number of decoders is low. The next section specifies how the refresh function may be implemented.

Note that the method (1) is currently implemented in the VIC videoconferencing software [[VIC](#)]. Methods (2) and (3) are currently implemented in the IVS videoconferencing software [[IVS](#)] .

##### **4.1 Use of optional H.261-specific control packets**

This specification defines two H.261-specific RTCP control packets, "Full INTRA-frame Request" and "Negative Acknowledgement", described in the next section. Their purpose is to speed up refreshment of the



video in those situations where their use is feasible. Support of these H.261-specific control packets by the H.261 sender is optional; in particular, early experiments have shown that the usage of this feature could have very negative effects when the number of sites is very large. Thus, these control packets should be used with caution.

The H.261-specific control packets differ from normal RTP packets in that they are not transmitted to the normal RTP destination transport address for the RTP session (which is often a multicast address). Instead, these control packets are sent directly via unicast from the decoder to the coder. The destination port for these control packets is the same port that the coder uses as a source port for transmitting RTP (data) packets. Therefore, these packets may be considered "reverse" control packets.

As a consequence, these control packets may only be used when no RTP mixers or translators intervene in the path from the coder to the decoder. If such intermediate systems do intervene, the address of the coder would no longer be present as the network-level source address in packets received by the decoder, and in fact, it might not be possible for the decoder to send packets directly to the coder.

Some reliable multicast protocols use similar NACK control packets transmitted over the normal multicast distribution channel, but they typically use random delays to prevent a NACK implosion problem [IEEE]. The goal of such protocols is to provide reliable multicast packet delivery at the expense of delay, which is appropriate for applications such as a shared whiteboard.

On the other hand, interactive video transmission is more sensitive to delay and does not require full reliability. For video applications it is more effective to send the NACK control packets as soon as possible, i.e. as soon as a loss is detected, without adding any random delays. In this case, multicasting the NACK control packets would generate useless traffic between receivers since only the coder will use them. But this method is only effective when the number of receivers is small. e.g. in IVS [[IVS](#)] the H.261 specific control packets are used only in point-to-point connections or in point-to-multipoint connections when there are less than 10 participants in the conference.

## 4.2 H.261 control packets definition

#### 4.2.1 Full INTRA-frame Request (FIR) packet

0										1										2										3									
0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9



```

+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|V=2|P|   MBZ   |   PT=RTCP_FIR   |           length           |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|
|                               SSRC                               |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+

```

This packet indicates that a receiver requires a full encoded image in order to either start decoding with an entire image or to refresh its image and speed the recovery after a burst of lost packets. The receiver requests the source to force the next image in full "INTRA-frame" coding mode, i.e. without using differential coding. The various fields are defined in the RTP specification [[RFC3550](#)]. SSRC is the synchronization source identifier for the sender of this packet. The value of the packet type (PT) identifier is the constant RTCP\_FIR (192).

#### 4.2.2 Negative Acknowledgements (NACK) packet

The format of the NACK packet is as follow:

```

      0               1               2               3
      0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 0 1
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|V=2|P|   MBZ   |   PT=RTCP_NACK   |           length           |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|
|                               SSRC                               |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+
|
|           FSN           |           BLP           |
+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+---+

```

The various fields T, P, PT, length and SSRC are defined in the RTP specification [[RFC3550](#)]. The value of the packet type (PT) identifier is the constant RTCP\_NACK (193). SSRC is the synchronization source identifier for the sender of this packet.

The two remaining fields have the following meanings:

First Sequence Number (FSN): 16 bits

Identifies the first sequence number lost.

Bitmask of following lost packets (BLP): 16 bits

A bit is set to 1 if the corresponding packet has been lost, and set to 0 otherwise. BLP is set to 0 only if no packet other than that being NACKed (using the FSN field) has been lost. BLP is set to 0x00001 if the packet corresponding to the FSN and the following packet have been lost, etc.



## **5. Payload Format Parameters**

This section updates the H.261 media type described in [RFC3555](#) [[RFC3555](#)].

This section specifies optional parameters that MAY be used to select optional features of the payload format. The parameters are specified here as part of the MIME subtype registration for the ITU-T H.261codec. A mapping of the parameters into the Session Description Protocol (SDP) [[RFC2327](#)] is also provided for those applications that use SDP. Multiple parameters SHOULD be expressed as a MIME media type string, in the form of a space-separated list of parameter=value pairs

### **5.1 IANA Considerations**

This section describes the MIME types and names associated with this payload format. The section registers the MIME types, as per [RFC2048](#) [[RFC2048](#)]

#### **5.1.1 Registration of MIME media type video/H261**

MIME media type name: video

MIME subtype name: H261

Required parameters: None

Optional parameters:

CIF: Describes the maximum supported frame rate for CIF resolution. permissible value are integer values 1 to 4 and it means that the maximum rate is 29.97/ specified value

QCIF: Describes the maximum supported frame rate for QCIF resolution. permissible value are integer values 1 to 4 and it means that the maximum rate is 29.97/ specified value

D: specifies support for still image graphics according to H.261 annex D.

Encoding considerations:

This type is only defined for transfer via RTP [[RFC3550](#)]

Security considerations: See [Section 6](#)

Interoperability considerations: none





Published specification: RFC yyy

Applications which use this media type:

Audio and video streaming and conferencing tools.

Additional information: none

Person and email address to contact for further information :

Roni Evenr: roni.even@polycom.co.il

Intended usage: COMMON

>Author/Change controller:

Roni Even

## **5.2 SDP Parameters**

The MIME media type video/H261 string is mapped to fields in the Session Description Protocol (SDP) as follows:

- o The media name in the "m=" line of SDP MUST be video.
- o The encoding name in the "a=rtpmap" line of SDP MUST be H261 (the MIME subtype).
- o The clock rate in the "a=rtpmap" line MUST be 90000.
- o The optional parameters "CIF", "QCIF" and "D" if any, SHALL be included in the "a=fmtp" line of SDP. These parameters are expressed as a MIME media type string, in the form of as a space separated list of parameter=value pairs."

An example of media representation in SDP is as follows: (CIF at 15 frames per second, QCIF at 30 frames per second and annex D

```
m=video 49170/2 RTP/AVP 98
```

```
a=rtpmap:98 H261/90000
```

```
a=fmtp:98 CIF=2 QCIF=3 D
```



## **6. Security Considerations**

RTP packets using the payload format defined in this specification are subject to the security considerations discussed in the RTP specification. This implies that confidentiality of the media streams is achieved by encryption. Because the data compression used with this payload format is applied end-to-end, encryption may be performed after compression so there is no conflict between the two operations.

## **7. Acknowledgements**

This is to acknowledge the work done by Petri Koskelainen from Nokia and Nermeen Ismail from Cisco who helped with drafting the text for the new MIME types.

## **8. Requirements notation**

The key words "MUST", "MUST NOT", "REQUIRED", "SHALL", "SHALL NOT", "SHOULD", "SHOULD NOT", "RECOMMENDED", "MAY", and "OPTIONAL" in this document are to be interpreted as described in [RFC2119](#)[[RFC2119](#)].

**9. changes from [RFC 2032](#)>**

The changes from the [RFC 2032](#) are:

1. The H.261 MIME type is now in the payload specification.

Added optional parameters to the H.261 MIME type

3. Editorial changes to be in line with RFC editing procedures

## Normative References

- [H261]      International Telecommunications Union, "Video codec for audiovisual services at p x 64 kbit/s", ITU Recommendation H.261, March 1993.
- [RFC2048]   Freed, N., Klensin, J. and J. Postel, "Multipurpose Internet Mail Extensions (MIME) Part Four: Registration Procedures", [BCP 13](#), [RFC 2048](#), November 1996.
- [RFC2119]   Bradner, S., "Key words for use in RFCs to Indicate Requirement Levels", [BCP 14](#), [RFC 2119](#), March 1997.
- [RFC2327]   Handley, M. and V. Jacobson, "SDP: Session Description Protocol", [RFC 2327](#), April 1998.
- [RFC3550]   Schulzrinne, H., Casner, S., Frederick, R. and V. Jacobson, "RTP: A Transport Protocol for Real-Time Applications", [RFC 3550](#), July 2003.
- [RFC3555]   Casner, S. and P. Hoschka, "MIME Type Registration of RTP Payload Formats", [RFC 3555](#), July 2003.





#### Informative References

- [BT601]    International Telecommunications Union, "Studio encoding parameters of digital television for standard 4:3 and wide-screen 16:9 aspect ratios", ITU-R Recommendation BT.601-5, October 1995.
- [H221]    International Telecommunications Union, "Frame structure for a 64 to 1920 kbit/s channel in audiovisual teleservices", ITU Recommendation H.221, May 1999.
- [IEEE]    Pingali, S., Towsley, D. and JF. Kurose, "A comparison of sender-initiated and receiver-initiated reliable multicast protocols", IEEE GLOBECOM 94, 1994.
- [INRIA]    Turlletti, T., "H.261 software codec for videoconferencing over the Internet", INRIA Research Report 1834, January 1993.
- [IVS]    Turlletti, T., "INRIA Videoconferencing tool (IVS), available by anonymous ftp from zenon.inria.fr in the "rodeo/ivs/last\_version" directory. See also URL <http://www.inria.fr/rodeo/ivs.html>".
- [MICE]    Sasse, MA., Bilting, U., Schultz, CD. and T. Turlletti, "Remote Seminars through MultiMedia Conferencing: Experiences from the MICE project", Proc. INET'94/JENC5, Prague pp. 251/1-251/8, June 1994.
- [VIC]    MacCanne, S., "VIC Videoconferencing tool, available by anonymous ftp from ee.lbl.gov in the "conferencing/vic" directory".

#### Authors' Addresses

Thierry Turlletti  
MIT

Christian Huitema  
Microsoft



Roni Even  
Polycom  
94 Derech Em Hamoshavot  
Petach Tikva 49130  
Israel  
  
EMail: [roni.even@polycom.co.il](mailto:roni.even@polycom.co.il)

## Intellectual Property Statement

The IETF takes no position regarding the validity or scope of any intellectual property or other rights that might be claimed to pertain to the implementation or use of the technology described in this document or the extent to which any license under such rights might or might not be available; neither does it represent that it has made any effort to identify any such rights. Information on the IETF's procedures with respect to rights in standards-track and standards-related documentation can be found in [BCP-11](#). Copies of claims of rights made available for publication and any assurances of licenses to be made available, or the result of an attempt made to obtain a general license or permission for the use of such proprietary rights by implementors or users of this specification can be obtained from the IETF Secretariat.

The IETF invites any interested party to bring to its attention any copyrights, patents or patent applications, or other proprietary rights which may cover technology that may be required to practice this standard. Please address the information to the IETF Executive Director.

## Full Copyright Statement

Copyright (C) The Internet Society (2003). All Rights Reserved.

This document and translations of it may be copied and furnished to others, and derivative works that comment on or otherwise explain it or assist in its implementation may be prepared, copied, published and distributed, in whole or in part, without restriction of any kind, provided that the above copyright notice and this paragraph are included on all such copies and derivative works. However, this document itself may not be modified in any way, such as by removing the copyright notice or references to the Internet Society or other Internet organizations, except as needed for the purpose of developing Internet standards in which case the procedures for copyrights defined in the Internet Standards process must be followed, or as required to translate it into languages other than English.

The limited permissions granted above are perpetual and will not be revoked by the Internet Society or its successors or assignees.

This document and the information contained herein is provided on an "AS IS" basis and THE INTERNET SOCIETY AND THE INTERNET ENGINEERING TASK FORCE DISCLAIMS ALL WARRANTIES, EXPRESS OR IMPLIED, INCLUDING BUT NOT LIMITED TO ANY WARRANTY THAT THE USE OF THE INFORMATION



HEREIN WILL NOT INFRINGE ANY RIGHTS OR ANY IMPLIED WARRANTIES OF  
MERCHANTABILITY OR FITNESS FOR A PARTICULAR PURPOSE.

#### Acknowledgment

Funding for the RFC Editor function is currently provided by the  
Internet Society.